



QUALITY ISSUES IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Shyamanta Chakraborty

Associate Professor, UGC-HRDC, Gauhati University, India.

ABSTRACT

The paper glimpses a comparative analysis on quality aspects of Indian higher education (IHE). Starting with growth and development of IHE, its present status in reference to its dimensions and quality in compare to international bench mark are discussed briefly. Discussing various issues of quality aspects of IHE. The paper put forward NAAC model used for quality assessment in IHE, discusses reasons for less qualitative and the steps to enhance and sustain quality in IHE. It also discusses some best practices for IHE for growth and sustain quality.

KEYWORDS: IHE, Quality, NAAC, QS-Rankings.

1. Growth of IHE

Dating back to the ancient period India has rich tradition of teaching-learning practices. Knowledge was preserved and propagated through oral tradition. During the regime of Mauryan dynasty in the 3rd and 2nd century BC, India flourished with the establishment of exclusive institutions of learning. There were universities like Taxila, Ujjain, Kanchi and some others for medicine and learning including mathematics and astronomy. Taxila which is now in Pakistan and Nalanda in eastern India were the famous Buddhist universities where several religious conclaves were held. The modern higher education system began with the establishment of Hindu College at Calcutta in 1817 by the great soul of Bengal Raja Rammohan Roy and his friend David Hare with the objective that it would provide real knowledge transferred from European sources to the intellect Indians. Over the years since then the growth of IHE is tremendous. The present number of institute under IHE are given below.

**Table I: List of Indian University and degree/diploma awarding Institutes
(as on 31.10.2016)**

Table I: List of Indian University and degree/diploma awarding Institutes (as on 31.10.2016)					
Degree/Diploma awarding Institute					
Central Institute	Nos.	State Institute	Nos.	Private Institute	Nos.
Degree Awarding Institutions	138	Degree Awarding Institutions	316	Degree Awarding Institutions	191
Central UG Colleges	69	State UG Colleges	25,302	Private Colleges	130
Central Diploma institutions	24	State Diploma Institutions	3, 207	Diploma institutions	9,541
Central University	43	State University	476	Private University	246
Institution of National Importance (e.g. IITs, NIT, IIITs etc.)	111				
Deemed University	123				

With total 769-universities and more than 38,500 affiliated colleges enrolling more than 31 million students, IHE is a largest and complex system. But the structure of all these degree-granting institutions are cumbersome; primarily due to "affiliation" and the funding patterns. Almost 86% of higher education students are enrolled in Bachelor's degree programs with majority enrolling in three-year B.A., B.Com. or B.Sc. degrees. Only one-sixth of the higher education students are enrolled in Engineering/Technology degrees. The percentage of enrolment in various levels and field of study are as follows.

2. Student Enrolment IHE

Table II: Students Enrolment, IHE

Constituent Colleges	State university	Central university	Deemed to be university	Institute of National Importance
21 %	46%	7 %	20 %	6 %
% of Enrolment faculty wise				
Arts	Science	Commerce & Management	Engineering	Other
37%	19%	18%	16%	10%

Table III: Level wise Students Enrolment, IHE

Level	Graduate (Bachelor's)	Post-Graduate (Master's)		Research (Doctoral)		Diploma/Certificate			Total
% of Total	86%	12%		01%		01%			100%
Faculty wise Students Enrolment									
Arts	Science	Comm Managt	Technical	Education	Medical	Agriculture	Veterinary	Law	Other
37%	19%	18%	16%	04%	02%	37%	0 %	0%	01

The Gross enrolment ratio (GER) which measures level of higher education is 23.6 (2014-15) where Men 24.5 and Women 22.7 only; whereas the global average slightly more than 29%; as follows.

Table IV: Student enrolment Country and Indian-State wise

Country-wise GER	State-wise GER		University + College		*Institutional density
Countries	GER	Chandigarh	41.4%	3 + 27	236.8
US	95%	Manipur	35.9%	3 + 80	3.6
UK	59%	Goa	33.2%	2 + 60	16.2
Japan	55%	Tamil Nadu	32.9%	55 + 2410	18.5
Malaysia	31%	Delhi	32.5%	25 + 240	161.8
China	28%	Andhra Pradesh	26.9%	47 + 4550	16.5
Brazil	20%	Mizoram	21.6%	3 + 28	1.3
India	19.4%	Nagaland	21.5%	4 + 58	3.5
World Average	29%	Assam	13.4%	15 + 507	6.5

*No. of institute per 1000 sq km

3. Quality Assurance in IHE

Today, almost every developing country has realized that they should not waste their money and value without optimum use of its educational mechanism. This is why the idea 'Quality' is in top of agenda in all kind of discussions today. According to Ronald Barnett [1992], QAHE measures institutional culture and can be assessed through 4-core activities namely Course/Programme Curriculum, Teaching-learning and Evaluation (TLE), Staff-Development, and Students-Assessment. Different countries have evolved different QAHE models for their Higher Education system as necessitated by their unique national context.

3.1 NAAC Model for Quality Assessment, IHE

In India, after the National policy Statements in 1968 & 1986 and their action plan in 1992, NAAC (National Accreditation and Assessment Council, India) was set up in 1994 with its headquarters in Bangalore. NAAC began to bench marking and grading from 1998. Till March 2013, only 31% of universities and 14% of colleges has been accredited while only a few have gone for re-accreditation. The assessment results/grades accredited by NAAC reflects the poor quality of many of its institutions of higher education. It demands a large improvement in quality of majority of universities and colleges and more specifically in the northeast India.

Table V : NAAC Criteria of Assessment

General Process of Assessment	NAAC 4-Stage Process for External Quality Assessment	NAAC 7-Point Criteria for accreditation of affiliated colleges	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-Evaluation Peer-reviewed by a panel of experts Statistical analysis or use of performance indicator or setting a benchmark for best practices. Survey by students or professional bodies, employees etc. Testing of knowledge and skill competencies 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying predetermined criteria Preparation and submission of self-study report by the institutional unit of assessment On-site visit of peer team for validation of the report and recommendation of assessment outcome Final decision by NAAC Executive Committee 		Weightage
		Curricular Aspect	50
		Teaching-learning and Evaluation	450
		Research, Consultancy and Evaluation	100
		Infrastructure and Learning Resources	100
		Student support and progression'	100
		Governance and Leadership	150
		Innovation practices	50
		Total	1000

Table VI : NAAC Grading on Assessment

	Cumulative Grade Points	Perform-ance	Status	Remarks
I.	3.76 to 4.00	A ⁺⁺	Accredited	High level academic accomplishment as expected from institute
II.	3.51 to 3.75	A ⁺	Accredited	Attaining excellence in academic accomplishment above the minimum
III.	3.01 to 3.50	A	Accredited	Attaining better level of academic accomplishment
IV.	2.76 to 3.00	B ⁺⁺	Accredited	Attaining good level of academic accomplishment
V.	2.51 to 2.75	B ⁺	Accredited	Attaining satisfactory level of academic accomplishment
VI.	2.01 to 2.50	B	Accredited	Attaining level of academic accomplishment
VII.	1.51 to 2.00	C	Accredited	Attaining minimum level of academic accomplishment
VIII.	≤ 1.50	D	Not Accredited	Unsuccessful in attaining satisfactory academic level

Table VII: Indian universities in top 400- QS World Rankings, 2016

Institution	2014 rank	2015 rank	2016 rank
Indian Institute of Science Bangalore	x	147	152
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay	222	202	219
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi	235	179	185
Indian Institute of Technology Madras	321	254	249
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur	300	271	302
Top 400- ASIA QS World Rankings 2016			
Institution	2016 rank	Institution	2016 rank
Indian Institute of Science Bangalore	33	University of Mumbai	145
Indian Institute of Technology Bombay	35	Banaras Hindu University	155
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi	36	Amrita Vishwa- Vidyam	169
Indian Institute of Technology Madras	43	University of Pune	176
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur	48	Birla Institute of Technology	178
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur	51	Amity University	195
University of Delhi	66	Manipal Academy	200
Indian Institute of Technology Roorkey	78	Indian Institute of Technology Hyderabad	231
Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati	94		
University of Calcutta	108		

3.2 Quality Concerns for IHE

In QS-Rankings, 2016, among 800- rankings only 14 Indian institutions are included, 2-universities within top 200-rank, 4-universities compared to 5-university in 2015 rankings within top 300 Universities. Among BRICK countries China not only obtained the top position but also the highest number 7 within top 10 positions. Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore which was at 5th in 2015 has come down to 6th in 2016. The position of Indian universities has consistently been falling year after year in almost all international rankings. Therefore, it is clear that more efforts are needed in the area of quality of higher education throughout country.

3.3 Reason of Poor Performance, Universities and Colleges, IHE

- (i) Low quality by National Standard
- (ii) Poor Planning and Funding :
- (iii) Faculty Shortage and Low Quality
- (iv) Politicisation of System
- (v) Less Competition among Universities And Colleges
- (vi) Large no. of Affiliated Colleges under a University
- (vii) GER Disparity within the Nation and State

There are wide disparity in the GER of higher education across the country, as follows.

- Inter-state disparity - 47.9% in Delhi vs. 9% in Assam.
- Urban-rural disparity - 30% in urban areas vs. 11.1% in rural areas.
- Community disparity - 14.8% for OBCs, 11.6% for SCs, 7.7% for STs and 9.6% for Muslims.
- Gender disparity – 16.5% for females vs. 20.9% for males.

- (viii) Low Citation Impact

4. Some Effective Practices for Quality Improvement in IHE

- Proper understanding the concept 'Quality of Education' is highly necessary
- More focus in raising level of teaching-learning within institute/college
- Systematic and well calibrated quality enhanced continuous programme,
- To encourage competition among learners/teachers with inter & inter college concept
- Debate and Discussion within institution about quality improvement, research, innovation and output
- Periodic critical self-assessment of academic and administrative performance
- Planned outlook on academic accountability
- To initiate local/district/state level innovative programmes
- Introduce LAN/ WAN and MIS through online
- Formulate 'College Performance Indicator' through survey or other methods for Quality Assurance.

- Activate 'Grievance Redressal Cell' for students and teachers, and to take prompt action where necessary.
- To create opportunities for student-faculty interactions
- Promote student involvement through engaged time and quality effort
- Engage students in active learning experiences with meaningful expectations
- Provide, receive, and use regular, timely, and specific feedback
- Explain present real-world applications
- Understand and value criteria and methods for student assessment

5. Conclusion:

The International Labour Organization (ILO) has predicted that by 2020, India will have 116 million workers in the age bracket of 20 to 24 years, as compared to China's 94 million. It is estimated that the average age of Indian by 2020 will be 29 years (for NE India 28 yrs) as against 40 years in USA, 46 years in Japan and 47 years in Europe. This trend Indian demography is very significant on the quantum of its population and its age structure. The system needs to focus on Technical education as well. There must be planned expansion. Greater emphasis need to be paid on the improvement of the quality of Teaching-Learning Processes in order to produce employable and competitive graduates, postgraduates and PhDs. There must be greater focus on research and innovation through both public and private institutes. Both the state universities and private university must be aided and properly funded.

4. REFERENCES:

1. Burke, J. Competency Based Education And Training, Lewes, Falmer Press, 1989
2. BIGGS, J, "The reflective institution: Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning" Journal of Higher Education, 41: 221-238, 2001.
3. Umashankar. V and Dutta. K "Balanced scorecards in managing higher education institutions an Indian perspective, International Journal of Educational Management, Vol. 21, No. 1, 2007, pp.54-67
4. Anbalagan. C; "Challenges and Prospects of Indian Higher Educational Services- A Global View" International Journal of Research in Management & Technology (IJRMT), Vol. 1, No.2, December 2011
5. Prasad V S and Antony Stella, "Best Practices Benchmarking in Higher Education for Quality Enhancement, Chapter I, higher education global trends and emerging opportunities to 2020, Going Global 2012, British Council; www.britishcouncil.org/higher-education
6. "All India Survey on Higher Education", 2011-12, MHRD, GoI, New Delhi, 2013
7. Saravanakumar A.R, "Present Scenario And Future Prospects Of Higher Education In India", Proceeding of the Social Sciences Research ICSSR 2014 (e-ISBN 978-967-11768-7-0). 9-10 June 2014
8. Chahal. M, "Higher Education in India: Emerging Issues, Challenges and Suggestions"; International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research, ISSN: 2349-5677, Volume 1, Issue 11, April 2015